

remarks on the nature and working of sarsen may be commended to the many (including some archæologists) to whom these important rocks are unfamiliar. He is at his best when dealing with structural problems, which he explains by means of photographs of models. If Stonehenge was not built thus (and there is no evidence that it was), it well might have been. Within its narrow but deliberately imposed limits, the present book is the best modern account of Stonehenge; but it falls short of the ideal by reason of those limitations. Nevertheless we think Mr. Stone was quite right to confine himself to certain aspects. He has spared no pains in testing possibilities and theories by means of experiment, so that he speaks upon many points with authority. His courage and enterprise in measuring the ringed stone in the river at Bulford deserve high commendation and reveal the true scientific spirit, for this can only be done when standing "up to one's waist in water." It is remarkable that he should have been the first archæologist to see the stone, others having written about it from hearsay only. The present writer can, however, testify to the difficulty of finding it, though its site is clearly marked on the 6-inch map; for he failed to do so after a long swim last year. The tales about the devil and the team of oxen will be familiar to students of folklore; they prove the great antiquity of the stone in its present position.

It is as a comparative archæologist that Mr. Stone is weakest. Surely it is untrue to say that Stonehenge has absolutely nothing in common with a stone circle except that its peristyle happens to be circular in plan (p. 34)? Admitting that the dressing and architecture of Stonehenge are unique, yet at its lowest it *is* a stone circle! Again, the present writer cannot agree that the Altar Stone was originally recumbent. This is a matter of opinion, where analogy helps. He would point to the "Cove" at Avebury and the Obelisk (upright in Stukeley's day, now gone altogether). It is not improbable, in the writer's opinion, that at the centre of both the circles at Avebury huge "dolmens" may have stood, for there is evidence of another upright once standing beside the Obelisk. If so, is it not at least more probable that a similar structure occupied the central position at Stonehenge? For both Stonehenge and Avebury, and other stone circles, may have served the double purpose of tomb and temple; and we know that the ordinary form of megalithic tomb was a "dolmen."

O. G. S. C.

Ordnance Survey of Scotland, "Popular" Edition. One-inch map.
Sheets Nos. 90, 91, and 93. *Price 1s. 6d. each.*

Conventional Signs and Writing for the Revised One-inch Map of Great Britain (Popular Edition), 1924. Price 6d.

Index to the Popular Edition Sheets of Scotland, 1924. Price 2d.

The one-inch "popular" Ordnance Survey maps of Scotland are just beginning to appear, and are worthy of particular note because they are so happy a blend of traditional symbol and technical progress. The Scottish small-scale maps have always had their own distinctive features. For example, they have, in the past, been on Bonne's projection whilst the English were on Cassini's. The lettering too has been distinctive and more attractive. No doubt the experience of carrying a new style over England shows where change is advisable on beginning Scotland, and then again Scotland must always be a temptation to the cartographer with its special opportunities of mountain, loch, and forest. The popular edition, on reaching Scotland, is but following precedent in its introduction of modification.

Perhaps the most important divergence from tradition is in the alteration of projection. The whole of the one-inch map of Great Britain is now to be

based on the same meridian (Delamere),* and the sheets are carried forward on Cassini's projection so that there is no break at the border. The most important technical innovation is the total reliance upon heliozincography. The half-inch and the new quarter-inch are of course drawn and heliozincographed, but so far the outline of the one-inch has been engraved on copper.

The size of the sheets is to be substantially larger than that of previous editions of Scotland. Most of them will be the 27 by 18 inch to which the popular edition of England has now accustomed us, but certain sheets are to be much larger. One, for example, is to be 34 by 24 inches. Ninety-two sheets will now suffice for Scotland in place of the previous 131. We cover the ground so much faster these days that the enlargement is obviously desirable.

Each sheet includes an overlap strip of one mile on its east and south edges. This strip will therefore be found also on the sheets which lie to the east and south. There has been a persistent demand for "overlap" which has not been met in the past, principally on technical grounds. Reproduction by heliozincography must make it much easier of attainment.

It is not so long ago that the Ordnance Survey broke away from the repelling official covers in which folded maps of the earlier editions were sold. The new one-inch of Scotland is to have an attractive cover, a little less topical than in the case of the English sheets, with the Lion in his proper shield and a border of crowns and thistles.

The beauties of the original engraved sheets are so often talked of, and the limitations of lithography so frequently deplored, that one is inclined to look anxiously for blemishes. But indeed they are hard to find in these maps. The lettering is bold but not obtrusive, and the outline too is bolder than heretofore, but both are justified because on a coloured map the outline must be bolder than on an engraved one in order to maintain its importance. On both the old large-sheet series and on the popular-edition sheets of England the names and detail are often too small—and the result is flat. Boldness may obviously be overdone. It is so sometimes, we think, in modern French maps, whilst German are inclined to retain the fineness of execution proper to an engraved map, and the flat effect of a black plate overshadowed by the other colours.

The increased size of lettering applies mainly to towns and villages. The names of "Large Towns" and "County Towns" are very much more prominent, but in general writing is better spaced out, and individual letters more rounded than on the engraved outlines. The sans-serif letters for hills and railway names and sloping lower case for minor headlands are also new, whilst parish names (and boundaries) omitted on the one-inch of England reappear. The larger-sized parish of Scotland is probably responsible for this difference.

A feature which strikes the eye at once is the blocked-in black for towns. So far it has been the custom to use a ruling ("hatching") for the centre portions of towns whilst the suburbs and scattered fringe of houses were shown in solid black. For small towns on a coloured map the solid black (throughout) is certainly preferable and maintains proper contrast with the surrounding parks and woods. It will be interesting to see the effect in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

* It would appear likely that the Delamere meridian was originally chosen so as to allow of both England and Scotland appearing in the same series. Too far west to be central for England and Wales, it is just right for Great Britain.

Parks now reappear on the black plate in the form in which they were shown on the large-sheet series. It is an illogical sign, of course, for to one unacquainted with Ordnance Survey precedent it looks like a black variety of the ordinary sign for sand. But we must be illogical occasionally. For instance, the tree still appears in profile like the mountains, churches, and dolphins on a mediæval map, and yet one would hardly care to change these beautifully clear deciduous and coniferous tree signs for the circles and "crowsfeet" generally used in French cartography. Such signs as these for trees come under the general heading of "ornament" in the Ordnance Survey, and one cannot but agree that there is some justification for the word. "Rough Pasture" is naturally something of a feature on the Scottish sheets. It is pleasant to see the edges, or limits, given. In England the edges of rough pasture are left undefined.

Turning to the blue plate, we find the firm single and double lines reappearing for rivers and streams. All cartographers will welcome them back. The solid light blue stream on the one-inch of England has a wholly indecisive effect.

The contour plate too is a happy one. The "reinforced" 250-feet interval contours help the sense of relief, and the intermediate contours are firm and yet fine. The real difficulty in contouring comes of course when we have to do with gentle yet intricate folds like those of the home counties. "Reinforced" contours help but little there. Either a small vertical interval or some additional shading or hachuring is wanted. In Scotland, however, the 50-feet contours, drawn as they are, should be an admirable guide.

The road classification and colouring remains as before. Some of us will regret it. Few airmen would use a half-inch map, and equally few motorists a one-inch. It seems a pity, then, that these bright red roads should remain to sink the rest of the map into comparative insignificance. It seems to us that one map, and that the one-inch, should aim first and foremost at portraying the country generally and its physical features in particular. Neither the soldier nor the civilian will study the one-inch for his motor routes, but both will desire to follow on it the accidents of the ground.

Many of the alterations which have been mentioned have been made possible by the new fair drawing for heliozincography. Without redrawing it would, for example, have been very difficult and costly to rewrite so many names. Some of these names have, by the way, been stamped, and it would be interesting to know how many users of the map can distinguish between the stamped and the written names.

We think that the Ordnance Survey is much to be congratulated on this new model, and prophesy that it will be still more "popular" than the last edition of England and Wales.

H. S. L. W.

The Blue Guides : England.— Ed. by Findlay Muirhead. Second edit. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1924. 6 × 3, pp. lxxxvi. + 632. 81 *Maps and Plans*. 16s. net.

Comprehensiveness and compactness must always be the conflicting aims of the compiler of guide books. To supply all the information which the tourist in England is likely to require would be beyond the capacity of even the substantial make-up of a volume in this series. Fortunately the tourist, from lack of time or initiative, rarely strays far from the well-worn tracks. The editor, perhaps realizing this, has grouped his material around a number of routes, which, radiating mainly from London, cover the country fairly thoroughly. The demands which a more enterprising traveller might make, he neatly parries